

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 1, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 14-18 under 35 USC Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Warsta. Claims 6-13 were rejected under 35 USC Section 102(b) being anticipated by Mendez. Claims 3, 4, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warsta in view of Mann. In view of the following comments, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration of the claims as presented herein is respectfully requested.

Warst discloses location updating in a mobile communication system wherein visitor location registers maintain the subscriber and location data of mobile subscribers visiting its service. Warst does not disclose a client device including a SIM client for securing communications, determining in a client device if an identifier received from a server is the same as the identifier stored at the client device, or using an authenticator and ciphering unit to secure communications as defined in the claims. Accordingly, Warst neither anticipates nor suggests the claimed invention, and can not render the claims unpatentable.

Mendez discloses a global translator to automatically synchronize multiple copies of a workspace element. Mendez fails to disclose a first authentication application unit in a client device and a second authentication application unit in a server device, let alone an authentication unit within the client device that compares the user unit code received from the server with a user unit code stored in the client device and executes a control command in response to the codes being the same. Accordingly Mann neither teaches nor suggests the claimed invention, and can not render the claimed invention unpatentable.

Mann discloses a server node which receives command messages from, and transmits response messages to, the client node over a data link. The server node selectively executes the command contained in each command message. However, Mann neither teaches nor suggests an authentication unit within the client device that compares the user unit code received from the server with a user unit code stored in the client device and executes a control command in response to the codes being the same. Accordingly Mann neither teaches nor suggests the claimed invention, and can not be fairly said to render the claimed invention unpatentable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims clearly define the invention and are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted

Pecen, Mark et al.

BY: 

Randall S. Vaas

01/03/2005

Date

Registration No. 34,479

Phone (847) 523-2327

Fax. No. (847) 523-2350